

Belvedere:

Jerry Butler **MINUTES**

Corte Madera:

MARIN TRANSPORTATION AND LAND USE SOLUTIONS (T-PLUS) Melissa Gill

ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING #5

Fairfax:

Lew Tremaine THURSDAY, OCTOBER 7, 2004

Larkspur:

4:00 P.M. Joan Lundstrom

Mill Valley: DPW Room 304 Conference Room Dick Swanson MARIN CIVIC CENTER

3501 Civic Center Drive San Rafael, CA 94903

Novato: Pat Eklund

Attending: Ross: Larry Chu Tom Byrnes

Barbara Collins

Wendy Kallins San Anselmo: Harvey Katz Peter Breen

Thomas Kronemeyer

San Rafael: Carey Lando Al Boro Trent Lethco

Nader Mansourian Sausalito: **Bob Pendolev** Amy Belser Michele Rodriguez

Steve Stein Tiburon:

Craig Thomas Yates Alice Fredericks

County of Marin:

Susan Adams Hal Brown Steve Kinsey Cynthia Murray Annette Rose

1. Introductions

The meeting started at 4:15 p.m. Introductions were made and an updated TPLUS schedule was passed out to AC members.

August, 2004 Meeting Minutes

There were no additional comments on the meeting minutes, which were accepted by the TPLUS AC members.

Discussion on Draft Regional TLC/HIP Program Guidelines 3. Lethco distributed a letter from MTC who provided only minor comments on the Marin TLC/HIP program. These comments were surrounding the fact that applicants are required to go through the federal aid process and that Marin's recommended minimum grant amount was lower compared to the regional program. MTC gave their general support but recommended ensuring Marin TLC/HIP applicants are aware of the extensive administrative burden that goes along with the federal aid process.

Lethco also summarized the comments received from September's TAM



meeting and asked for comments on the options presented. Kallins summarized Her concerns with the currently-recommended TLC/HIP call for projects. Chu summarized the emailed comments from Nancy Weininger, MCBC, distributed to the TPLUS AC. She recommended combining the funding for both TLC and HIP, but placing an additional boost for HIP project applications. Yates brought up the MTC's LIFT program. Staff summarized MTC's Community Based Transportation Planning grant opportunity in the Canal area and Marin City area and noted that completion of these plans could be a vehicle to help boost projects to be funded through either Local or Regional TLC funds and other funding opportunities.

Kallins, Kronemeyer and Lethco had further discussion around what HIP is intended to accomplish. It was further clarified that HIP is a program that uses the mechanism of the provision of housing to trigger qualification for transportation capital funding.

Katz noted that the creation of HIP was intended to create and support HIP development. He noted that there is a problem with the lack of housing here in Marin, but we shouldn't try to change or go against the program. Lethco noted that we could opt to go with either or both programs, depending on what was most important to Marin. These draft Program Guidelines were created based upon the AC's decision early on to help incentivize housing in Marin. Because of the many different timelines associated with housing projects, it was recommended to leave it as an open call, and then issue a call for projects for TLC projects with leftover funding.

Rodriguez asked if we could alter the readiness criteria for HIP to address Kallins' issues. Lethco said it was more of a philosophical issue because Kallins wants only TLC individually but is willing to compromise.

Lethco noted as an example only that Fairfax could change their zoning, produce more housing in order to make projects in Fairfax.

Chu asked Lethco's observations on the suggestion to flip the priority for HIP and TLC each year. Lethco noted that it is important to make the program predictable to make it easier for potential applicants to be able to plan their timelines. Kallins noted that we were trying to pool funds together to make it enough money to do a couple projects each call.

Yates asked whether it is required to be new housing created, or if existing housing could qualify. Lethco confirmed that it is required to be new housing. Collins indicated that she would not prefer to do flip flopping of priorities as a result of the difficulty in meeting the readiness criteria. Lethco noted that HIP is targeted to incentivize the decisionmakers to keep the density higher and not downzone or lessen the number of approved units.

Katz noted that there is a lot of NIMBYs in this county and the HIP can help the decisionmakers respond appropriately to NIMBYs. Chu noted that with the inclusionary housing requirements it requires the jurisdiction to give the improvements away and that HIP will help balance the funding discrepancy out.

Pendoley likes the way the proposal has gone and wants to support encouraging housing. Every little incentive will pay off. Mansourian agrees with Pendoley. Katz is unsure whether GGT has an official position on this issue but supports housing and transportation

improvements. He supports incentivizing housing. Rodriguez agrees with Pendoley. Yates will go with what works best. Stein understands Kallins' concern but because of the small size of the funding, we should retain the HIP component. Chu agrees with Pendoley and hopes that both Measure A and Prop 1A passes to help provide additional funding for transportation projects. Kallins supports Lethco's compromise offer to allow one year of TLC funding to start in the beginning along with HIP to allow some bike/ped projects. Collins is willing to consider the compromise and also agrees that HIP should play an important role.

For the benefit of the Committee, Lethco summarized again the compromise call for projects: Open the 3-year HIP call, and then offer 1 year of TLC funding concurrently with the beginning of the HIP call. Mansourian would agree to do that if it is used to supplement a project that is short on funding.

Lethco confirmed with the committee that there is consensus that it would be just a stand alone call for projects and not just a supplemental. 3 year open cycle for HIP and make the remaining 1 year of available funding for a TLC call right away. If at the end of the three year cycle, or during one of the annual TAM reviews of the program, issue a TLC call for projects for leftover funds.

4. Discussion on Draft TOD/PeD Principles, Benefits, and Issues/Barriers

Kronemeyer summarized the comments document and pointed out where rephrasing of the Principles would be changed as a result of TAM Commissioner comments, specifically with more explicit reference to childhood obesity and addressing the issue of brownfields. It was suggested to add "for the benefit of public health" to address the childhood obesity comment. Chu suggested that it would more appropriately be located in the Benefits section or say something about the benefit would address the increasing obesity as a result of the lack of physical activity. Rephrase the physical health bullet and add a sentence under the Principle. There was consensus of the committee to make this change. Kronemeyer noted that, with reference to brownfields, we can also address grayfields and can address this by treating it similarly as the other comment. The commissioner's comment was to target these sites for development. The Committee felt this should be included in the benefits section and not further defined in the Principles section. The Committee also felt that the air rights should also be added in this same manner.

Corridors with "higher frequencies" could address the Commissioner's concern about the phrase "major transit corridors." The Committee agreed that major transportation corridors "of Marin" could be added to address this concern.

Collins suggested that housing "project" should not be used in the document, but rather use the word "development."

5. Public Comments

No comments from the public were received.

6. Confirm/Schedule Next Meeting Date and Time

Next TPLUS AC meeting will be November 4, 4:00 p.m. in the DPW Conference Room.